

**GOOGLE LLC'S MOTION
IN LIMINE NO. 2 TO
EXCLUDE EVIDENCE
AND ARGUMENT
REGARDING
CLASSWIDE DAMAGES
AND CERTAIN OTHER
DAMAGES EVIDENCE**

**Redacted Version of
Document Sought
to be Sealed**

QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP

Stephen A. Broome (CA Bar No. 314605)
stephenbroome@quinnemanuel.com
Viola Trebicka (CA Bar No. 269526)
violatrebicka@quinnemanuel.com
Crystal Nix-Hines (Bar No. 326971)
crystalnixhines@quinnemanuel.com
Rachael L. McCracken (Bar No. 252660)
rachaelmccracken@quinnemanuel.com
Alyssa G. Olson (CA Bar No. 305705)
alyolson@quinnemanuel.com
865 S. Figueroa Street, 10th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Telephone: (213) 443-3000
Facsimile: (213) 443-3100

Andrew H. Schapiro (admitted *pro hac vice*)
andrewschapiro@quinnemanuel.com
Teuta Fani (admitted *pro hac vice*)
teutafani@quinnemanuel.com
Joseph H. Margolies (admitted *pro hac vice*)
josephmargolies@quinnemanuel.com
191 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 2700
Chicago, IL 60606
Telephone: (312) 705-7400
Facsimile: (312) 705-7401

Jomaire Crawford (admitted *pro hac vice*)
jomairecrawford@quinnemanuel.com
D. Seth Fortenbery (admitted *pro hac vice*)
sethfortenbery@quinnemanuel.com
51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor
New York, NY 10010
Telephone: (212) 849-7000
Facsimile: (212) 849-7100

Xi ("Tracy") Gao (CA Bar No. 326266)
tracygao@quinnemanuel.com
Carl Spilly (admitted *pro hac vice*)
carlspilly@quinnemanuel.com
1300 I Street NW, Suite 900
Washington D.C., 20005
Telephone: (202) 538-8000
Facsimile: (202) 538-8100

Counsel for Defendant Google LLC
Additional counsel on signature pages

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, OAKLAND DIVISION**

CHASOM BROWN, *et al.*, individually and
on behalf of themselves and all others
similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

GOOGLE LLC,

Defendant.

Case No. 4:20-cv-03664-YGR-SVK

**GOOGLE LLC'S MOTION *IN LIMINE*
NO. 2 TO EXCLUDE EVIDENCE AND
ARGUMENT REGARDING CLASS-
WIDE DAMAGES AND CERTAIN
OTHER DAMAGES EVIDENCE**

Hon. Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers

Trial Date: January 29, 2024

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 Pursuant to Federal Rules of Evidence 402 and 403, Google respectfully moves to exclude:
 3 (1) all evidence and argument regarding class-wide damages numbers, methodologies, inputs, and
 4 Google-wide financials, (2) all evidence and argument regarding unjust enrichment, (3) Plaintiffs’
 5 expert Michael Lasinski’s testimony and methodology on statutory damages, and (4) all evidence
 6 and argument regarding purported harm to Plaintiffs’ “peace of mind.”

7 **II. ARGUMENT**

8 **A. All Evidence and Argument Regarding Class-wide Damages, Models, Inputs,
 and Google’s Financials Should Be Excluded**

9 The Court denied Plaintiffs’ request to certify a damages class under Rule 23(b)(3). Dkt. 803
 10 at 32. Evidence and argument regarding class-wide damages, models, inputs, and related Google
 11 financials is irrelevant and highly prejudicial, including at least the documents identified by Bates
 12 Number in Exhibit A to the October 17, 2023 Declaration of Donald Seth Fortenbery.

13 First, these topics are irrelevant. Plaintiffs’ individual damages (if any) are the only monetary
 14 damages inquiry for the jury. Evidence and argument related to damages, models, inputs, and
 15 financial figures that relate to the class’s purported damages are irrelevant and should be excluded.
 16 Fed. R. Civ. P. 401; *see also Little v. Washington Metro. Area Transit Auth.*, 249 F. Supp. 3d 394,
 17 414 (D.D.C. 2017) (“Because the Court will not certify a Rule 23(b)(3) class, Dr. Bendick’s
 18 computation of damages is not relevant and will be excluded.”).

19 Second, even if the multi-billion-dollar class-wide damages figures Plaintiffs claim had scant
 20 relevance, it would be prejudicial to allow Plaintiffs to tout these eye-popping numbers to the jury.
 21 Plaintiffs contend that Google caused the class to suffer [REDACTED] in “actual” damages, and up
 22 to [REDACTED] in unjust enrichment damages. Lasinski Rep. ¶¶ 1, 55-184.¹ Plaintiffs base these
 23 figures on irrelevant Google financials such as all “U.S. advertising revenues from Search Ads,
 24 YouTube Ads, and Display Ads” (products that benefit from private browsing data only minimally),
 25 and estimates that [REDACTED]

26
 27 ¹ As explained further below, these figures cannot be apportioned to these named Plaintiffs. *Infra*
 28 Section II. Moreover, the [REDACTED] “actual” damages figure is further irrelevant because
 Plaintiffs posit a method of calculating these damages that is specific to the individual Plaintiffs
 and does not involve that number. Pretrial Statement, at Plaintiffs’ Statement on Damages.

1 [REDACTED]—could cause an impact of up to [REDACTED] per year. *Id.* ¶¶ 35, 64. In stark contrast,
 2 Plaintiffs admit they seek less than [REDACTED] apiece in actual damages, and do not even quantify their
 3 unjust enrichment damages.² Plainly, presenting damages figures that are [REDACTED] of dollars greater
 4 than the damages actually sought would prejudice Google by exciting the emotions of the jury and
 5 causing them to think that Google caused more financial harm than is actually at issue in the trial.
 6 *See Multimedia Pat. Tr. v. Apple Inc.*, 2012 WL 12868264, at *6 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 20, 2012)
 7 (precluding evidence showing revenues or profits because “[t]he disclosure that a company has
 8 made \$19 billion dollars in revenue from an infringing product cannot help but skew the damages
 9 horizon for the jury” (quotation omitted)).

10 Third, the jury would be thoroughly confused by evidence of irrelevant class-wide damages,
 11 the methodologies for calculating them, and Google financials relating to products and services that
 12 have little if anything to do with the case. If such evidence were allowed, Google’s cross-
 13 examination of Mr. Lasinski regarding the flaws in his class-wide damages methodology, the
 14 complicated math supporting his class-wide damages, his chosen inputs, and the rebuttal opinion of
 15 Google’s expert witness, Bruce Strombom, would only further confuse the jury. *See, e.g., Tennison*
 16 *v. Circus Circus Enterprises, Inc.*, 244 F.3d 684, 690 (9th Cir. 2001) (upholding exclusion of
 17 “testimony [that] might have resulted in a ‘mini trial,’ considering that much of the[] testimony was
 18 disputed by Defendants”); *see also Snyder v. Bank of Am., N.A.*, 2020 WL 6462400, at *11 (N.D.
 19 Cal. Nov. 3, 2020) (excluding “damages [that] are irrelevant [because] to raise them would risk
 20 confusing the jury as to which damages are in fact recoverable”).

21 Finally, the fact that Plaintiffs are representing a Rule 23(b)(2) injunctive relief class
 22 obviously is no reason to allow them to present evidence of class-wide damages to the jury. The
 23 certified class is not entitled to any monetary damages,³ and class-wide damages figures and models

24 _____
 25 ² Even using Mr. Lasinski’s (flawed) class-wide unjust enrichment number divided by his (equally
 26 flawed) total class member number, *see* Lasinski Rep. ¶ 197, each Plaintiff’s damages would come
 27 out to a range of [REDACTED].

28 ³ The *only* monetary relief, *if any*, available to a Rule 23(b)(2) class is monetary relief “incidental”
 to the injunctive or declaratory relief sought, which is not the case where there are “individualized
 determinations of each [class member]’s eligibility for [monetary damages].” *Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.*
v. Dukes, 564 U.S. 338, 360, 366-67 (2011). This Court has already determined (Dkt. 803 at 32)
 liability for damages cannot be decided class wide—making any restitution and disgorgement

are not relevant to Plaintiffs’ request for punitive damages.⁴

B. All Evidence and Argument Regarding Unjust Enrichment Should Be Excluded

Plaintiffs’ only evidence of unjust enrichment damages is Mr. Lasinski’s class-wide unjust enrichment calculation. Nowhere does Mr. Lasinski (or anyone else) calculate an unjust enrichment number for the Named Plaintiffs. In a single paragraph in his report, Mr. Lasinski hypothesizes that “Google’s unjust enrichment . . . could be readily allocated,” and then gestures towards a complicated method by which he would (a) use classwide inputs to identify a dollar value for a single unique monthly private browsing instance (“UMPBI”)—which Mr. Lasinski explains “represents one or more pageloads in Incognito Mode or an Other Private Browsing Mode on a single device during a one-month period,” Lasinski Rep. ¶ 1—and then (b) somehow allocate classwide unjust enrichment “as a function of the number of UMPBI deemed attributable to each Class member.” *Id.* ¶ 197. Yet there is *no* evidence in the record about how many UMPBI are attributable to each Plaintiff, or *any* methodology about how to attribute UMPBI to a given Plaintiff.

Mr. Lasinski also suggests that class-wide damages could be apportioned by simply dividing the total unjust enrichment damages by the number of class members. *Id.* ¶ 197. This method is wholly improper because it awards Plaintiffs unjust enrichment damages *regardless* of the extent to which Google actually profited off of their data (if at all). And it is highly prejudicial because the calculation begins with a multi-billion-dollar *class-wide* damages figure attributable to a Rule 23(b)(3) class that the Court denied.

C. Mr. Lasinski’s Opinions and Testimony Regarding Statutory Damages Have No Relevance in the Trial

Mr. Lasinski: (1) does not calculate a statutory damages figure for any Plaintiff; (2) concedes that he has “not investigated or made any determination regarding the relevant damages rate” for individual statutory violations; and (3) provides no insight into what act or acts constitutes a violation of the statutes for purposes of calculating statutory damages or how many violations

claims non-incidental. *See, e.g., Young v. Neurobrands, LLC*, 2020 WL 11762212, at *8 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 15, 2020) (restitution and disgorgement not incidental where they “would turn on the individual circumstances of each class member’s purchase”); *I.B. by & through Bohannon v. Facebook, Inc.*, 82 F. Supp. 3d 1115, 1132 (N.D. Cal. 2015) (similar).

⁴ Punitive damages “may not be used to punish [Google] for the impact of [its] alleged misconduct on persons other than [plaintiffs].” CACI No. 3942.

1 occurred. *Id.* ¶¶ 185-186 (explaining his opinions “focus on how statutory damages could be
 2 calculated *for the two [Rule 23(b)(3)] Classes for the Class Period*” (emphasis added)). Moreover,
 3 Mr. Lasinski proposes “four potential bases to which an appropriate damages rate could be applied,”
 4 *see id.* ¶¶ 1, 186, but not one of those is helpful here. The first two bases (relying on “pageloads” in
 5 Incognito and UMPBI, explained above) require user-specific evidence (e.g., the number of private
 6 browsing mode page loads per plaintiff) that does not exist for any of the Plaintiffs. The third and
 7 fourth bases rely on “unique private browsing instances *across the Classes*” and “[t]he number of
 8 members *in each Class*” and are therefore also useless for purposes of calculating the Named
 9 Plaintiffs’ statutory damages.

10 **D. The Court Should Exclude All Evidence and Argument Regarding Purported 11 Harm to Plaintiffs’ Peace of Mind**

12 In their pretrial statement, Plaintiffs assert for the first time in this three-year litigation that
 13 they will seek damages based on “harm [to] their peace of mind [and] feel[ing] powerless.” This
 14 damages theory should be precluded because Plaintiffs failed to timely disclose it—even in the
 15 Fourth Amended Complaint, which Plaintiffs amended specifically “to clarify which remedies apply
 16 to each claim.” Dkt. 880 at 1; *Hoffman v. Constr. Protective Servs., Inc.*, 541 F.3d 1175, 1179 (9th
 17 Cir. 2008) (upholding exclusion of damages theory where it was first disclosed through pretrial
 18 conference). Nor did Plaintiffs disclose it in discovery.⁵ In any event, there is no evidence in the
 19 record to support or calculate such damages for any Plaintiff. When asked to “[d]escribe with
 20 particularity how YOU have been harmed or damaged by [Google’s] conduct,” none of the Plaintiffs
 21 identified such harms or ways to quantify them. Fortenbery Decl., Ex. B (Pl. Responses to
 22 Interrogatory No. 3). Plaintiffs’ new and unsupported theory of damages has no place in this trial.

23 **III. CONCLUSION**

24 For the foregoing reasons, the Court should exclude any evidence or argument regarding
 25 class-wide damages models, unjust enrichment, statutory damages, and late-disclosed damages
 26 theories.

27 ⁵ “Rule 26(a)(1)(A)(iii) requires the disclosure of ‘a computation of each category of damages
 28 claimed by the disclosing party.’ . . . Rule 37(c)(1) gives teeth to these requirements by forbidding
 the use at trial of any information required to be disclosed by Rule 26(a) that is not properly
 disclosed.” *Hoffman*, 541 F.3d at 1179 (quotations omitted).

1
2 DATED: October 17, 2023

3 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
4 SULLIVAN, LLP

5 By /s/ Andrew H Schapiro
6 Andrew H. Schapiro

7 Andrew H. Schapiro (admitted *pro hac vice*)
8 andrewschapiro@quinnemanuel.com
9 Teuta Fani (admitted *pro hac vice*)
10 teutafani@quinnemanuel.com
11 Joseph H. Margolies (admitted *pro hac vice*)
12 josephmargolies@quinnemanuel.com
13 191 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 2700
14 Chicago, IL 60606
15 Telephone: (312) 705-7400
16 Facsimile: (312) 705-7401

17 Diane M. Doolittle (CA Bar No. 142046)
18 dianedoolittle@quinnemanuel.com
19 Sara Jenkins (CA Bar No. 230097)
20 sarajenkins@quinnemanuel.com
21 555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor
22 Redwood Shores, CA 94065
23 Telephone: (650) 801-5000
24 Facsimile: (650) 801-5100

25 Stephen A. Broome (CA Bar No. 314605)
26 stephenbroome@quinnemanuel.com
27 Viola Trebicka (CA Bar No. 269526)
28 violatrebicka@quinnemanuel.com
Crystal Nix-Hines (Bar No. 326971)
crystalnixhines@quinnemanuel.com
Rachael L. McCracken (Bar No. 252660)
rachaelmccracken@quinnemanuel.com
Alyssa G. Olson (CA Bar No. 305705)
alyolson@quinnemanuel.com
865 S. Figueroa Street, 10th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Telephone: (213) 443-3000
Facsimile: (213) 443-3100

Jomaire Crawford (admitted *pro hac vice*)
jomairecrawford@quinnemanuel.com
D. Seth Fortenbery (admitted *pro hac vice*)
sethfortenbery@quinnemanuel.com

1 51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor
2 New York, NY 10010
3 Telephone: (212) 849-7000
4 Facsimile: (212) 849-7100

5 Jonathan Tse (CA Bar No. 305468)
6 jonathantse@quinnemanuel.com
7 50 California Street, 22nd Floor
8 San Francisco, CA 94111
9 Telephone: (415) 875-6600
10 Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

11 *Attorneys for Defendant Google LLC*
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28